

### **REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated December 14, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 4, and 10 are hereby amended. Accordingly, claims 1–18 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent, Publication No. 10-91345, to Matsuzaki (hereinafter “Matsuzaki”); claims 2–5, 8, 9, 11–14, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,211 to Diessner (hereinafter “Diessner”); and claims 6, 7, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,461,202 to Sera et al. (hereinafter “Sera”).

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 1 and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 1, as amended, is allowable in that it recites “a flexible printed circuit film connected to [a] wiring terminal; an adhesion part corresponding to a location where the flexible printed circuit film is connected to the wiring terminal; and an adhesion-reinforcing part formed on a rear surface of the touch panel device that increases an adhesive bonding strength of the adhesion part.” Nothing in Matsuzaki teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The Examiner cites FIGs. 2 and 4 of Diessner as teaching this feature of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In contrast, Diessner teaches “a loop-like segment 55” that is disposed to the side of the touch panel. (FIG. 4 and col. 4, l. 31). Applicant respectfully asserts that the above feature of the claimed invention is patentably distinct from this teaching of Diessner.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over any combination of Matsuzaki and Diessner.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 10 and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 10 is allowable in that it recites “[a] method of fabricating a touch panel device, comprising ... forming a flexible printed circuit film ... forming an adhesion part ... forming an adhesion-reinforcing part on a rear surface of the touch panel device, wherein the adhesion-reinforcing part increases an adhesive bonding strength of the adhesion part.” Nothing in Matsuzaki (or Driessner) teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same of similar reasons as those regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is allowable over any combination of Matsuzaki and Diessner.

In the Office Action, claims 2–5, 8, 9, 11–14, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki in view of Diessner. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 2–5, 8, and 9, and requests reconsideration. Claims 2–5, 8, 9, which depend from independent claim 1, are allowable because Diessner fails to cure the deficiency of Matsuzaki to teach or suggest “a flexible printed circuit film connected to [a] wiring terminal; an adhesion part corresponding to a location where the flexible printed circuit film is connected to the wiring terminal; and an adhesion-reinforcing part formed on a rear surface of the touch panel device that increases an adhesive bonding strength of the adhesion part.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2–5, 8, and 9, as they depend from independent claim 1, are allowable over any combination of Matsuzaki and Driessner.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 11–14, 17, and 18 and requests reconsideration. Claims 11–14, 17, and 18, which depend from independent claim 10, are allowable in that Driessner fails to cure the deficiency of Matsuzaki to teach or suggest “[a] method of fabricating a touch panel device, comprising ... forming a flexible printed circuit film ... forming an adhesion part ... forming an adhesion-reinforcing part on a rear surface of

the touch panel device, wherein the adhesion-reinforcing part increases an adhesive bonding strength of the adhesion part.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11–14, 17, and 18, as they depend from independent claim 19, are allowable over any combination of Matsuzaki and Driessner.

In the Office Action, claims 6, 7, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki in view of Sera. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 6 and 7 and requests reconsideration. Claims 6 and 7, which depend from independent claim 1, are allowable because Sera fails to cure the deficiency of Matsuzaki to teach or suggest “a flexible printed circuit film connected to [a] wiring terminal; an adhesion part corresponding to a location where the flexible printed circuit film is connected to the wiring terminal; and an adhesion-reinforcing part formed on a rear surface of the touch panel device that increases an adhesive bonding strength of the adhesion part.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6 and 7, as they depend from independent claim 1, are allowable over any combination of Matsuzaki and Sera.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 15 and 16 and request reconsideration. Claims 15 and 16, which depend from independent claim 10, are allowable in that Sera fails to cure the deficiency of Matsuzaki to teach or suggest “[a] method of fabricating a touch panel device, comprising ... forming a flexible printed circuit film ... forming an adhesion part ... forming an adhesion-reinforcing part on a rear surface of the touch panel device, wherein the adhesion-reinforcing part increases an adhesive bonding strength of the adhesion part.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 and 16, as they depend from independent claim 10, are allowable over any combination of Matsuzaki and Sera.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to

discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: March 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes  
Valerie P. Hayes  
Registration No.: 53,005  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant